



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,409	05/03/2004	King-Tung Huang	WISP0052USA	3408
27765	7590	06/28/2005	EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE (NAIPC)			EDWARDS, ANTHONY Q	
P.O. BOX 506			ART UNIT	
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			PAPER NUMBER	
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/709,409	HUANG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Anthony Q. Edwards	2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-17 and 19-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 15-17 and 19-26 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4,7-14,27,29 and 31-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3,5,28 and 30 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 May 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

The indicated allowability of claims 6 and 16 is withdrawn in view of the Examiner's finding and interpretation of a "slit" as it relates to element (311) of Chein et al., and the slit's relationship to a fastener sliding along the slit. The rejections of claims 6 and 16 are based on the same reference applied in the first Office Action as provided below.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 12, 27, 29, 31-33 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,517,129 to Chien et al. ("Chien" hereinafter). Referring to claim 1, Chien discloses a folding frame (see Fig. 3) with a rotatable hook (see Fig 10), comprising an upper body (22), a lower body (21), a fixing device (1) disposed on the upper body (22), a hook (63) rotatably coupled to the lower body (21), wherein the hook is unhooked from the fixing device when the hook is rotated into the lower body and the hook is engaged with the fixing device when the hook is rotated out from the lower body (see col. 6, lines 8-15), and a fastener (4/6) for rotating the hook opposite to the lower body. It should be noted that the Examiner contents that the "fastener" of Chien is a two-part "fastener," i.e., comprising elements 4 and 6 (see Figs. 10, 11 and 14 and the corresponding specification). Chein also discloses the

folding frame having a slit (311), wherein the fastener (i.e., element 4) slides along the slit for rotating the hook. See Figs. 4 and 6 and the corresponding specification.

Referring to claim 27, Chien discloses a folding frame (see Fig. 3) with a rotatable hook (see Fig 10), comprising an upper body (22), a lower body (21), a fixing device (1) disposed on the upper body (22), a hook (63) rotatably coupled to the lower body (21), wherein the hook is unhooked from the fixing device when the hook is rotated into the lower body and the hook is engaged with the fixing device when the hook is rotated out from the lower body (see col. 6, lines 8-15), and a fastener (4/6) for rotating the hook opposite to the lower body (see Fig. 10 and the corresponding specification), the fastener (i.e., element 6) comprising a shaft (62), wherein a first end of the shaft (i.e., the lower end) is coupled to the hook, and a spring (64), wherein a first end of the spring is coupled to a second end of the shaft (i.e., the upper end). See Fig. 10.

Referring to claim 2, Chien discloses a folding frame wherein the fastener (i.e., element 6) comprises a shaft (62), wherein a first end of the shaft (i.e., the lower end) is coupled to the hook, and a spring (64), wherein a first end of the spring is coupled to a second end of the shaft (i.e., the upper end), see Fig. 10.

Referring to claims 4 and 29, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein a first end of the latch pin is coupled to a second end of the spring (see Fig. 11) and a second end of the latch pin is exposed outside the lower body (see Fig. 14).

Referring to claims 7 and 32, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein the fixing device (i.e., element 4) comprises a magnet (415), and the hook (63) comprises a magnetic metal. See Fig. 4 and col. 6, lines 14-15.

Referring to claims 8 and 33, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein the upper body is a display module and the lower body is a system module. See Fig. 3 and the corresponding specification.

Referring to claims 12 and 37, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein the frame is notebook computer. See Fig. 3 and the corresponding specification.

Referring to claim 31, Chien discloses a folding frame, further comprising a slit (311), wherein the fastener (i.e., element 4) slides along the slit for rotating the hook. See Figs. 4 and 6 and the corresponding specification.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 34-36, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chien in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,509 to Kono. Referring to claims 9, 11, 34 and 36, the portable computer of Chien inherently teaches the system module comprising a central processing unit, a memory module and a bus interface for receiving and/or outputting signals from/to another system. Chien does not teach the system module including a wireless module for transmitting signals wirelessly. Kono teaches providing a system module (see Fig. 6 and the corresponding specification) with a wireless module for transmitting signals wirelessly.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the system module of Chien with a wireless module, as taught by Kono, since the

device of Kono allow would allow for the utilization of wireless technology that is common place in today's computer systems.

Referring to claims 10 and 35, Chien discloses a folding frame as claimed, except for the lower body being a display and the upper body being a system module. It has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art (see *In re Japiske*, 86 USPQ 70). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to rearrange the display and system module of Chien as needed, since this arrangement would be more useful when the hinge (211) of Chien allows for backward rotation beyond 180 degrees.

Referring to claims 13 and 38, Chien discloses a portable PC (2), wherein the upper body (22) is a display module, the upper body connected (*sic*) to the lower body (21) rotatably and with the fixing devices (1) set on both sides. See Fig. 4 and col. 6, lines 30-39. Chien does not teach the display module comprising a touch panel. Kono teaches providing a portable PC (1), wherein the display (2) comprises a touch panel (see Fig. 10 and the corresponding specification).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the display module of Chien to include a touch panel, as taught by Kono, since the device of Kono would provide the portable PC of Chien with a greater variety of data input methods, i.e., stylus pen units, etc.

Referring to claims 14 and 39, Chen discloses the folding frame as claimed, except for the device being an electronic translator. Kono teaches providing a folding frame for an

electronic device, including an electronic translator (see Fig. 8 and the corresponding specification).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify device of Chien to include an electronic translator, as taught by Kono, since the device of Kono would allow the device of Chien to be used during trips to foreign countries to translate words and/or calculate foreign currency equivalents.

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

Claims 3 and 28 a are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The reasons for allowance relate to the specific limitation of the spring moving the shaft (i.e., the shaft is not stationary) for rotating the hook, in combination with the rest of the elements or steps, is not taught or suggested by the prior art references.

Claims 5 and 30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The reasons for allowance relate to the specific limitation of the second end of the latch pin being connected to a knob, wherein the hook is rotated forward when the knob is moved, in combination with the rest of the elements or steps, is not taught or suggested by the prior art references.

Claims 15-17 and 19-26 are allowed. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: referring to claim 15, as indicated above, the prior art references, alone or in combination do not teach the specific limitation of the second end of the latch pin being connected to a knob, wherein the hook is rotated forward when the knob is moved. Claims 16,

17 and 19-26 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 15 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

***Response to Arguments***

The Examiner appreciates the applicant's correction of the claims 13 and 25, as well as applicant's comments regarding claims 10, 11, 22 and 23. As such, the objections to these claims have been withdrawn.

Furthermore, applicant's arguments, March 30, 2005, with respect to claims 3 and 28 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed March 30, 2005 relating to claims 1, 2 and 27 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As indicated above, the Examiner contends that Chien discloses a two-part "fastener," i.e., comprising elements 4 and 6 (see Figs. 10, 11 and 14 and the corresponding specification), wherein the fastener (i.e., element 6) comprises a shaft (62), wherein a first end of the shaft (i.e., the lower end) is coupled to the hook, and a spring (64), wherein a first end of the spring is coupled to a second end of the shaft (i.e., the upper end), see Fig. 10.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Q. Edwards whose telephone number is 571-272-2042. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-3:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn D. Feild can be reached on 571-272-2800, ext. 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 16, 2005

aqe

  
LYNN FEILD  
SUPERVISING PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800